

---

## **Environmental Assessment**

**Addition to Building 201 Project# WWYK 050076  
Tinker Air Force Base (TAFB), Oklahoma  
January 2005**

<b>Report Documentation Page</b>			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
<p>Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.</p>				
1. REPORT DATE <b>JAN 2005</b>	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2005 to 00-00-2005</b>		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Environmental Assessment: Addition to Building 201 Project# WWYK 050076 Tinker Air Force Base (TAFB), Oklahoma</b>			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Oklahoma City Air Logistics Complex (OC-ALC/EM), 7701 Arnold St., Tinker AFB, OK, 73145</b>			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>17</b>
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON	

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

### Environmental Assessment for the Addition to Building 201 Project# WWYK 050076 Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma

---

The United States Air Force (USAF) has conducted an Environmental Assessment (EA) that provides an analysis of the environmental impacts associated with the construction of the addition to Building 201 at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma.

#### Description of Proposed Action

The proposed action is to construct an addition to Building 201 at Tinker Air Force Base. The Specialized Management Directorate (OC-ALC/QL) is currently located in the southwest corner of Building 201. The Specialized Management Directorate is currently experiencing an increase in workload. Therefore additional space is needed to accommodate the workload increase. Space for current personnel does not meet the requirements set in AFH 32-1084, 1 September 1996.

The addition would be approximately 4,000 square feet. The addition would be made up of administrative space, a conference room, a document destruction room, and an equipment room. The addition would meet all of the proponent's requirements.

#### Alternatives

##### “No-Action” Alternative

By definition, the “No-Action” Alternative is a continuation of existing conditions. The Specialized Management Directorate would continue to operate in overcrowded conditions and would be unable to meet the requirements of the increased workload.

##### Action Alternative

Other alternatives were identified and analyzed to determine their feasibility. After careful consideration, the following alternatives were eliminated because of their cost, logistics, or the time constraints:

- One alternative was to build an addition on the east side. The logistics of the addition would not have met the proponent's requirements. The proponent required that the addition be contiguous with the current area. Utilities on the east side would have to be relocated. Relocating the utilities may require asbestos removal, which would add to the cost and time of the project.
- Another alternative was to build a separate facility not connected to Building 201. Building a new facility would not have met the proponent's requirement to have a contiguous area. The new building would have required a new siting. The project would have also required an Environmental Assessment. Therefore it would not have been cost effective and it would not have met the time constraints.

## **Environmental Consequences**

No unavoidable adverse environmental effects from the implementation of the proposed action, action alternatives, or the no-action alternative have been identified through this EA.

No long-term significant adverse effects and no unavoidable adverse environmental effects from the implementation of the proposed action have been identified through this EA. As a result, no long-term mitigation measures are required.

Beneficial impacts of the proposed action include a cost effective and an efficient logistical method of improving the quality of life for QL personnel at Tinker Air Force Base within their required timelines.

## **Conclusion**

The attached EA was prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 6050.1, U.S. Air Force Instruction (AFI) 32-7061, and Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) Final Rule (32 CFR 989).

The finding of this EA is that the Proposed Action will have no significant impact on the human or natural environment; therefore, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) statement is issued for the proposed action, and no Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required.

Approved: Joan M. Cunningham Date: 26 Feb 05  
JOAN M. CUNNINGHAM, Colonel, USAF  
Chairperson, Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health Council

Property of:  
Integrated Environmental Team Library  
OC-AIC/EM  
7701 Arnold St., Ste. 213A  
Tinker Air Force Base, OK 73145

---

## **Environmental Assessment**

**Addition to Building 201 Project# WWYK 050076  
Tinker Air Force Base (TAFB), Oklahoma  
January 2005**

---

## **1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED**

---

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared by Environmental Management, Tinker Air Force Base (TAFB), Oklahoma. This assessment describes the construction of an addition to Building 201 at Tinker AFB in order to evaluate the level of required environmental documentation.

### **1.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

See Figure 1 – Building 201.

### **1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION**

The Specialized Management Directorate (OC-ALC/QL) is currently experiencing an increase in workload. Therefore additional space is needed to accommodate the workload increase. Space for current personnel does not meet the requirements set forth in Air Force Handbook 32-1084, *Facility Requirements, September 1, 1996*.

#### **1.3.1 Applicable Regulatory Requirements**

Federal agencies that fund, support, permit, or implement major programs and activities are required to take into consideration the environmental consequences of proposed actions in the decision-making process under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, Title 42, United States Code (USC), Section 4321, et seq. (42 USC 4321 et seq.). The intent of NEPA is to protect, restore, or enhance the environment through well-informed federal decisions. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) was established under NEPA to implement and oversee federal policy in this process. The CEQ issued regulations implementing the process in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Parts 1500-1508 (40 CFR 1500-1508). The CEQ regulations require that an EA:

- Briefly provide evidence and analysis to determine whether the Proposed Action might have significant effects that would require preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). If the analysis determines that the environmental effects will not be significant, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be prepared for the approval of the decision maker.
- Facilitate the preparation of an EIS, if required.

This Abbreviated EA is part of the procedures for implementing the NEPA for the proposed project as set forth in Air Force Instruction 32-7061, *The Environmental Impact Analysis Process, July 15, 1999*, and 32 CFR 989.



---

## **2.0 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION**

---

The proposed action addressed in this abbreviated EA is to construct an addition on the southwest corner of Building 201. This chapter briefly describes the proposed action and evaluates potential alternatives.

The criteria used to select reasonable alternatives based on the purpose and need of the proposed action and to eliminate those that did not meet the criteria are as follows:

- Current location and working condition of OC-ALC/QL personnel;
- Technical feasibility, defined as the best process to determine how to alleviate the current working conditions of the OC-ALC/QL personnel and to meet requirements for the increased workload;
- Economic feasibility, defined as funding constraints, needs, and timelines required for project completion

### **2.1 PROPOSED ACTION**

The proposed action is to construct an addition onto the west side of Building 201 currently occupied by OC-ALC/QL at Tinker Air Force Base. The OC-ALC/QL office is located in the southwest corner of Building 201. The current office space does not meet the requirements for the increased QL workload. The administrative personnel space is already overcrowded and does not meet the standards set in AFH 32-1084, 1 September 1996. The addition would be approximately 4,000 square feet. The addition would be made up of administrative space, a conference room, a document destruction room, and an equipment room. The addition would meet all of the proponent's requirements.

### **2.2 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

The No-Action Alternative is not considered a reasonable alternative, because it would not change present conditions and it would not meet the increased workload.

### **2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED**

Other alternatives were identified and analyzed to determine their feasibility. After careful consideration, the following alternatives were eliminated because of their cost, logistics, or the time constraints:

- One alternative was to build an addition on the east side. The logistics of the addition would not have met the proponent's requirements. The proponent required that the addition be contiguous with the current area. Utilities on the east side would have to be relocated. Relocating the utilities may require asbestos removal, which would add to the cost and time of the project.

---

- Another alternative was to build a separate facility not connected to Building 201. Building a new facility would not have met the proponent's requirement to have a contiguous area. The new building would have required a new siting. The project would have also required an Environmental Assessment. Therefore it would not have been cost effective and it would not have met the time constraints.

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Explanation
AFB	Air Force Base
AFH	Air Force Handbook
AFMA	Air Force Manpower Agency
BMPs	Best Management Practices
E	Endangered
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIG	Engineering Installation Group
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Presidential Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FY	Fiscal Year
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
QL	Specialized Management Directorate
TAFB	Tinker AFB, Oklahoma
USC	United States Code

---

## **3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

---

### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

This section discusses the environmental resources that may potentially be affected by the proposed action. The components of the affected environment discussed in this section are those for which impacts have been identified, or those which require regulatory consultation review. The following resource areas are discussed within this section: topography and soils, air quality, surface water, biological resources, solid waste, and hazardous waste. The following information is based upon the Tinker AFB *General Plan* (Tinker AFB, 2000) and the Tinker AFB *Natural Resources Management Plan* (NRMP) (Tinker AFB, July 2000).

### **3.2 LOCATION, HISTORY, AND CURRENT MISSION OF THE INSTALLATION**

Tinker AFB is located in Oklahoma County in the southeastern city limits of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The base covers more than 5,000 acres and abuts Midwest City to the north and Del City to the west.

Tinker AFB began operations in 1941, when Oklahoma City was awarded a maintenance and supply depot from the War Department. Immediately following World War II, Tinker AFB expanded to include the Douglas aircraft assembly plant and was named the Oklahoma City Air Material Area (OCAMA). OCAMA was overhauled in the 1950s to accommodate the B-52 bomber and KC-135 tanker. In the 1960s, Tinker AFB began to support additional aircraft including the J57, TF30, and J79 engines. In 1967, Tinker AFB was designated an inland aerial port of embarkation (APOE) for Southeast Asia. During the 1970s, Tinker AFB assumed management of new weapons including the A-7D Corsair, E-3A Airborne Warning and Control (AWAC) aircraft, E-4 Airborne Command Post aircraft, and air- and ground-launched missiles. In 1974, Tinker AFB was renamed the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center (OC-ALC). During the following years, Tinker AFB added support for the B-1 bomber, medium-range surface-to-air missile, and F108-100 engine. The 28<sup>th</sup> Air Division was activated to handle the expanded E-3 AWAC operations. In 1991, two Navy E-6 squadrons were added to maintain a flying/communications link between the White House and ballistic missile submarines around the world.

Today, the OC-ALC provides worldwide logistics support for a variety of weapons systems including the B-52, multipurpose 135 series, E-3 and E-4 aircraft, B-2 stealth bomber, B-1 bomber, and the short-range attack missile. The OC-ALC also manages both air- and ground-launched cruise missiles. Tenant organizations at Tinker AFB include units of the Air Combat Command, Air Force Communications Agency, Air Force Reserve, and Air Mobility Command.

---

### **3.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AREA**

#### **3.3.1 Topography and Soils**

##### **3.3.1.1 Topography**

Tinker AFB is located in the Central Redbed Plains section of the Central Lowland Physiographic Province. The Central Lowland Province is characterized by level to gently rolling hills, broad flat plains, and bottomlands intersected by small- to medium-sized watercourses. Oklahoma County elevations range from about 850 feet above mean sea level (MSL) in the southeastern part to 1,300 feet MSL in the northwestern part. Base elevations range from approximately 1,200 feet MSL (Crutcho Creek – northwestern portion of base) to 1,310 feet above MSL (southeastern portion of base).

##### **3.3.1.2 Soils**

Tinker AFB lies within three major soil associations: Darnell-Stephenville Association (DS), Dale-Canadian-Port (DCP) Association, and Renthin-Vernon-Bethany (RVB) Association. The DS Association consists of shallow to deep sloping loamy soils in upland areas. The DCP Association consists of deep loamy alluvial soils typically occurring in or near bottomlands along watercourses. The RVB Association consists of shallow to deep loamy and clayey soils typically occurring in upland areas. Sloping within this association varies from nearly level to moderately steep. According to the soil survey completed in 1983 and updated in 1991 by the USDA NRCS, 89 acres were classified as prime farmland. Prime farmland is defined as land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed and crops. When Tinker AFB was surveyed, much of the land (approximately 300 acres) that would have been designated prime farmland in the past had long since been urbanized, and therefore no longer met prime farmland criteria.

#### **3.3.2 Air Quality**

Tinker AFB and the surrounding area have a warm, temperate climate. Seasonal storms provide precipitation, with the heaviest amounts occurring in spring and summer. Spring and summer storms are often severe, with tornados occurring primarily in April and May.

The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) has adopted air quality standards that are identical to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Oklahoma County, which includes Tinker AFB and the surrounding areas, is in compliance with the NAAQS. There are no Federal Class I Prevention of Significant Deterioration (having degradation of ambient air quality), including strictly limited visibility, areas located in the Oklahoma City region (40 CFR 81.424).

#### **3.3.3 Surface Water**

Tinker's surface drainage occurs in three primary drainage basins: 1) Crutcho Creek Drainage Basin, 2) Elm Creek Drainage Basin, and 3) Hog Creek Drainage Basin. These are further

---

divided into ten sub-basins or watersheds. The majority of Tinker land is drained by the Crutcho Creek Drainage Basin which flows to the north into the North Canadian River. Eventually the North Canadian River combines with the Arkansas River, Mississippi River, and finally discharges into the Gulf of Mexico. The Elm Creek and Hog Creek Drainage Basins flow to the south of the base into the Little River which forms confluences with the South Canadian River, Arkansas River, Mississippi River, and discharges into the Gulf of Mexico. On-base lotic waters comprise a total of about eight linear miles. The first and second order segments are typically ephemeral or intermittent while the third order segment is perennial. All base creek flows are the result of stormwater runoff. No significant point source industrial discharges currently are made to any waterway on Tinker AFB. The Building 201 area is within the Crutcho Creek Drainage Basin.

### **3.3.4 Biological Resources**

The site for the proposed action is a building. No threatened or endangered plant species are present in this area. Also, no rare or endangered animals or species of concern are known to be present on the proposed action site.

### **3.3.5 Hazardous and Toxic Materials and Waste**

All hazardous waste generated at Tinker AFB and sent for disposal is tracked from “cradle to grave.” This tracking function is currently being converted to a computerized system being adopted by the USAF known as the Hazardous Material Management System. A number of hazardous materials are stored and used at Tinker AFB. Most of the materials used are related to aircraft use and maintenance (i.e., jet fuel, oil, hydraulic fluid, paint, paint thinners, and various solvents and cleaners). According to the General Plan (Tinker AFB, 2000), the base generated approximately 3,000 tons of hazardous waste in 1999. Since 1991, Tinker AFB has received no Notices of Violation from annual State and EPA inspections of its hazardous waste program. Tinker AFB has reduced its hazardous waste generation by at least 50 percent from the 1992 baseline, reaching a mandated Executive Order goal of 50 percent reduction by 1999.

All of the materials used on the installation are stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with the Tinker AFB Spill Prevention Plan, the SARA Title III Response Plan, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P), and other applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

Tinker AFB Instruction 32-7004, *Hazardous Waste Management*, contains information needed to comply with all federal, state, USAF, and local rules and regulations pertaining to hazardous waste. Other applicable documents include the *RCRA Operating Permit* for long-term storage of hazardous waste, and OC-ALC Plan 19-2, *Tinker AFB Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan*.

---

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

---

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

The primary purpose of an EA prepared in accordance with NEPA is to identify the potential impacts of a major federal action on the environment. The identification of potential impacts included consideration of both the context and the degree of the impact. When feasible, distinctions were made between short-term and long-term, and negligible and adverse impacts. A negligible impact may have an inconsequential effect or be unlikely to occur; an adverse impact would have negative consequences. If the current condition of a resource is improved or an undesirable impact is lessened, the impact is considered beneficial. Finally, a “no impact” determination is made when the proposed action does not noticeably affect a given resource.

### **4.2 EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES ON THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

#### **4.2.1 Topography and Soils**

##### **4.2.1.1 Topography**

###### **Proposed Action**

Implementation of the proposed action will require grading and excavation activities during site preparation. The proposed action will not significantly alter the existing topography or change the overall drainage patterns at Building 201. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to the area's topography are anticipated.

###### **No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, no grading or excavation activities would occur and no impacts to the area topography would occur.

##### **4.2.1.2 Soils**

###### **Proposed Action**

Construction of an addition would result in temporary impacts to onsite soils during removal of existing pavement and foundation grading activities. Existing soils are already disturbed from previous construction and paving activity. Any impacts would be temporary and minor. As such, no significant impacts to soils would result. Erosion would be minimized using best management practices (BMPs) as identified in the Tinker AFB Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (Tinker AFB, October 2002).

###### **No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, there would be no impacts to soils.

#### **4.2.2 Air Quality**

##### **Proposed Action**

---

Construction, operation, or maintenance of the proposed action is not expected to have any adverse effects on regional air quality. Construction operations would produce temporary, minor amounts of fugitive dust. Significant impacts from fugitive dust would be avoided through the use of construction BMPs to control fugitive dust generation.

The Specialized Management Directorate's increased workload for the facility would not result in emissions of hazardous air pollutants or any other substances that could impact air quality.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, the proposed action would not occur, resulting in no impacts to air quality.

#### **4.2.3 Surface Water**

**Proposed Action**

Construction of the addition will not impact surface waters because there are no surface waters at or near the site. Stormwater runoff from areas disturbed during construction could increase turbidity, siltation, and sedimentation to receiving streams. All construction activities would comply with Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Construction Activities GP-005A. Prior to obtaining a construction site digging permit, a detailed site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, (SWP3) outlining stormwater discharge BMPs and control measures would be submitted to ODEQ. All BMPs outlined in the SWP3 must be followed during construction. After construction, the site would be stabilized to at least 50 percent of its original condition and would comply with the *Tinker AFB Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan* (Tinker AFB, October 2002). Post-construction volume of stormwater would be the same as current conditions, because the amount of impervious surface would not change.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, the proposed action would not occur, resulting in no impacts to surface water.

#### **4.2.4 Biological Resources**

**Proposed Action**

The proposed action will have no impact on terrestrial biota or threatened or endangered species.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, no impacts to biological resources or threatened or endangered species would occur.

#### **4.2.5 Hazardous and Toxic Materials and Waste**

**Proposed Action**

All of the materials used in connection with the proposed action will be stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with the Tinker AFB Spill Prevention Plan, the SARA Title III

---

Response Plan, the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan, and other applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Hazardous waste generated through the activities will also be handled in accordance with Tinker AFB Instruction 32-7004, Hazardous Waste Management, the RCRA Operating Permit, OC-ALC Plan 19-2, Tinker AFB Spill Prevention and Emergency Response Plan, and applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The proposed action in conjunction with the proper handling of hazardous waste will result in no significant long-term impacts to the environment.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, the proposed action would not occur, resulting in no handling or production of hazardous and toxic materials and associated waste.

#### **4.2.6 Socio-Economics**

##### **4.2.6.1 Population**

**Proposed Action**

The proposed action would not change the population in the Tinker AFB area, because no personnel would be relocated, and the indirect impacts associated with the construction of the new facility are not expected to induce persons to relocate to the area. The area's minority and low-income communities and children would experience no disproportionate or negative impacts from the proposed facility's construction and operation, because noise, air quality, ground and surface water, hazardous and toxic materials and wastes, and contaminated sites would not be significantly affected by the proposed action. Any impacts resulting from construction would be confined to the installation and have no impacts on minority and low-income communities and children.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, no change to population levels would occur. Therefore, no impact to the population would occur under the no-action alternative.

##### **4.2.6.2 Employment**

**Proposed Action**

The proposed action would require construction of a new addition for Building 201. Based on the estimated cost and duration of construction, approximately 100 full-time equivalent construction jobs would be generated in FY 05-06. The impact of these jobs would be limited to the years in which the expenditures would occur and labor would be provided from the local area (Oklahoma City region) construction workforce. The proposed action would not have a significant impact on the total labor force, employment, or unemployment in the Tinker AFB area. The estimated jobs generated during construction and initial outfitting would be temporary and represent less than 1 percent of total employment at Tinker AFB and a much smaller fraction of the regional employment. Any benefit to the local economy would be temporary. Operations inside the addition will represent a workload already performed by Tinker AFB personnel and increased efficiency and production of support services from the infrastructure, and not an increase in employment at the base.

---

**No-Action Alternative**

The no-action alternative involves the continuation of present conditions. For this reason, no impact to employment would occur.

**4.2.6.3 Income****Proposed Action**

The economic impact of the proposed action would be mostly limited to temporary effects of construction. As discussed above, the temporary construction jobs would represent much less than 1 percent of the region's economy and would not be significant. Operation and maintenance of the new addition would not result in the need for additional staff. If additional staff were required for the operation and maintenance of the new addition, however, income generated by on-base employment would increase, although minimally. Expenditures for construction-related materials and supplies would have a small short-term beneficial effect on the economy of Oklahoma City and the surrounding area. Businesses near Tinker AFB, such as gas stations and fast-food restaurants, could see temporary benefits from additional sales to construction workers.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, no construction-related income would be generated and there would be no change to income levels. Therefore, no impact to income would occur under the no-action alternative.

**4.2.6.4 Installation Contribution to the Local Economy****Proposed Action**

The economic impact of the proposed action is less than 1 percent of Tinker AFB's annual overall impact on the regional economy. Because the economic impact will be small, impacts to Tinker AFB's contribution to the local economy will not be significant.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative there would be no impact to Tinker AFB's contribution to the economy.

**4.2.6.5 Utilities and Solid Waste****Proposed Action**

Construction of the preferred alternative would have little impact on utilities, such as electricity and natural gas used for heating/cooling and lighting. A new minimal demand on utilities would be added with the Building 201 addition on Tinker AFB. Construction of the new addition could involve the location, removal, and replacement of existing underground utilities. This would result in temporary localized utility disruptions. Such impacts are not considered significant, however, and would result in upgrades through new infrastructure.

Construction-related waste would not place an undue burden on existing solid waste disposal facilities in the area. Construction of the proposed action would have no effect on solid waste

---

handling, because the proposed addition would accommodate existing workload levels and would not represent an increase in existing workloads. All solid waste handling would comply with the recycling consent procurement requirements of Executive Order (EO) 13101, Section 6002 of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, the existing facilities would continue to be used at current utility demand levels, resulting in no impacts to existing utilities or solid waste handling abilities.

**4.2.6.6 Transportation and Parking**

**Proposed Action**

The proposed action would not result in an increase in personnel assigned to Tinker AFB and would not generate a long-term increase in traffic on local roads. Construction may result in temporary transportation impacts when road access is briefly interrupted for construction deliveries.

The new addition takes away a few parking spaces, therefore a need for new parking spaces would exist. However, there is ample parking in the parking lot west of Building 201 to accommodate the need for parking.

**No-Action Alternative**

Under the no-action alternative, no impacts to transportation or parking would occur.

**4.3 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL MITIGATION ACTIONS**

No long-term significant adverse effects were identified. As a result, no mitigation measures are planned.

**4.4 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

No unavoidable adverse environmental effects from the implementation of either the proposed action or the no-action alternative have been identified through this EA.

**4.5 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SHORT-TERM USE OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY**

The proposed action will not affect the long-term productivity of the environment because no significant environmental impacts or depletion of natural resources have been identified through this EA, nor are any anticipated through the implementation of the proposed action. No irreversible or irretrievable commitment of natural resources has been identified through this EA. Completion of the proposed action will allow for a tenant organization to better fulfill mission objectives, leading to greater long-term productivity at the installation.

**4.6 CUMULATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

---

The CEQ regulations implementing NEPA require agencies to consider the potential for cumulative impacts of proposed actions. “Cumulative impact” is defined in 40 CFR 1508.7 as “the impact on the environment in which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions... Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant factors taking place over time.”

No environmental impacts from the proposed action have been identified through this EA. Therefore, no cumulative impacts to natural environmental resources are anticipated from the interaction of the proposed action with other projects either on-base or in the region.